

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the Office Action mailed August 1, 2007, submitted concurrently with a one month extension of time to extend the due date for response to December 1, 2007.

By this Amendment, claims 1-3, 5, 7, 11, 14, 15 and 18 have been amended to direct to the allowable subject matter noted by the Examiner. More specifically, claims 1-3 have been amended to recite a method of denitration by incorporating the limitations of claim 10. Further, claims 5 and 7 have been amended to incorporate the limitations of original claims 1 and 2, and claim 11 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of original claim 13. Also, claims 17 and 18 have been amended to depend only on claims 15 and 11, respectively. Thus, in view of these changes to the claims, claims 4, 10 and 13 has been canceled. Thus, claims 1-3, 5-9, 11, 12, and 14-18 are currently pending in this application. Support for the claim amendments can be readily found variously throughout the specification and the original claims.

In view of these amendments, Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Objection to the Oath and Declaration

The Examiner has noted that the oath and declaration is defective since the oath and declaration filed April 29, 2005 omits the names, signatures, dates, citizenships, residences and post office addresses for all of the inventors. After reviewing the filed documents of the present application, Applicants are very confused regarding Examiner's statements in this regard. First, no oath and declaration was filed on April 29, 2005 in this application. Also, the oath and declaration filed with the application on September 28, 2004 contains all the information noted missing by the Examiner. For the Examiner's convenience and consideration, Applicant has submitted the oath and declaration filed in this application on September 28, 2004.

Objection to the Abstract of the Disclosure

The Examiner has objected to the abstract for exceeding 150 words in length. Thus, Applicant has amended the abstract in accordance with the Examiner's request. Thus, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite. This rejection has been rendered moot by the cancellation of claim 4.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102


Claims 1-4, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Hollstein et al. (U.S. Patent No 5,780,383). This rejection has been overcome by the amendments to claims 1-3 which incorporate the limitations of allowable claim 10, and the amendment to claim 11 which incorporates the limitations of allowable claim 13. Thus, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

Dated: November 7, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Lee Cheng
Registration No.: 40,949

CHENG LAW GROUP PLLC
1100 17th Street N.W.
Suite 503
Washington, DC 20036
202-530-1280
Attorneys for Applicant

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the Credit Card Account No. provided in the PTO-2038 form filed with this paper for any such fees; and applicant(s) hereby petition for any needed extension of time.